

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/537,777	06/06/2005	Tomoaki Mori	07409.0042	4874	
22852 7590 09/14/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER		
			HUNTER, ALVIN A		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3711		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

 		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/537,777	MORI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Alvin A. Hunter	3711			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app		1			
Period fo	• •					
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. Poply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ju	uly 2007.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims		•			
5)⊠ 6)□ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 15-19 and 22-25 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav Claim(s) 23-25 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 15-19 and 22 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers		•			
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand ion is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority ı	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior ☐ application from the International Bureau ☐ See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Ap ity documents have been r ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)		·			
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) //Mail Date formal Patent Application 			

Application/Control Number: 10/537,777

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 13 and 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,7, and 8 of copending Application No. 10537776. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Applicant only discloses that the crown member is no more than 0.8 times that of the sole member whereas application No 10537776 discloses that the ratio is 0.75 or less and that the ratio is based off of which is higher or lower, meaning that the crown may have a rigidity less than the crown or vice versa. Because of such, the instant claims are anticipated.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 23-25 are allowed.

Claims 15-19 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/12/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to the double patenting rejection that the instant application is still pending. The fact that the instant application is still pending is irrelevant.

With respect to the prior art rejection, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 10/537,777

Art Unit: 3711

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is 571-272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim, can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 $\Lambda\Lambda H$ Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.

EUGENE KIM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 4